

1 CAROL A SOBEL SBN 84483  
2 Weston Rowland SBN 327599  
3 Law Office of Carol A. Sobel  
4 2632 Wilshire Boulevard, #552  
5 Santa Monica, CA 90403  
t. (310) 393-3055  
e. carolsobellaw@gmail.com  
e. rowland.weston@gmail.com

6 David Loy SBN 229235  
7 Aaron R. Field SBN 310648  
First Amendment Coalition  
534 4th St., Suite B  
8 San Rafael, CA 94901  
t.(415) 460-5060  
e. dloy@firstamendmentcoalition.org  
e. afield@firstamendmentcoalition.org

9  
10 Peter Bibring SBN 223981  
11 Law Office of Peter Bibring  
12 2140 W Sunset Blvd # 203,  
Los Angeles, CA 90026  
t.(213) 471-2022  
e. peter@bibringlaw.com

13  
14 Paul Hoffman, SBN 71244  
Michael Seplow, SBN 150183  
John Washington, SBN 315991  
Schonbrun, Seplow, Harris, Hoffman  
& Zeldes LLP  
200 Pier Avenue #226  
Hermosa Beach, California 90254  
t.(310) 396-0731  
e. hoffpaul@aol.com  
e. mseplow@sshhzlaw.com  
e. jwashington@sshhzlaw.com

15 Susan E Seager SBN 204824  
Law Office of Susan Seager  
128 N. Fair Oaks Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91103  
t. (310) 890-8991  
e. susanseager1999@gmail.com

16 **United States District Court**  
17 **Central District of California – Western Division**

18 LOS ANGELES PRESS CLUB,  
19 STATUS COUP,

20 PLAINTIFFS,

21 v.  
22 CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal  
entity, jIM McDONNELL, LAPD  
CHIEF, sued in his official capacity;

23 DEFENDANTS.

24 Case No. 2:25-CV-05423-HDV-E

25 REPLY TO OPPOSITION TO EX  
26 PARTE APPLICATION;  
27 DECLARATIONS IN SUPPORT  
28 THEREOF

DATE: N/A

TIME: N/A

CTRM: 5B Hon. Hernàn Vera

1           **I. THERE WAS NO DELAY IN FILING FOR AN INJUNCTION**

2           Defendants assert that Plaintiffs unreasonably delayed in filing this motion,  
3 undercutting the need for emergency relief. Not only is that argument false on the  
4 facts, but it is also wholly inapplicable here where the threat of harm continues: there  
5 is no indication that the ICE raids currently terrorizing Los Angeles in DHS'  
6 campaign to remove 3,000 immigrants a day will end any time soon, nor will the  
7 protests, the media's response to them, nor LAPD's unconstitutionally aggressive  
8 response. To the contrary, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Kristi Noem  
9 has stated the ICE raids will continue in Los Angeles: "We are not going away. We  
10 are staying here to liberate the city from the socialist and the burdensome leadership  
11 that this governor and that this mayor have placed on this country and what they have  
12 tried to insert into this city."<sup>1</sup>

13           First, there is no indication that Plaintiffs engaged in any delay. They filed  
14 their complaint ten days after the second weekend of protests, and their application  
15 for injunctive relief ten days after that. In support of the request for injunctive relief,  
16 plaintiffs submitted substantial evidence: 10 declarations from members of the press  
17 who were subjected to the range of unlawful conduct challenged here, experts on  
18 police policy and the very serious harm the "less-lethal" munitions cause, and 80  
19 exhibits, most substantiating incidents of unlawful force and exclusion of press from  
20 access to these events and also multiple reports identifying the repeated failure of the  
21 LAPD to comply with past court orders and settlements protecting press access and  
22 restricting force as a crowd control tactic.

23           Second, the threat of injury remains ongoing, as ICE raids, protests, and law  
24 enforcement interference with journalists covering the protests continue. Indeed, on  
25 July 7, the day *before* Defendants filed their opposition, federal agents occupied  
26  
27

---

28<sup>1</sup> <https://www.foxla.com/news/ice-in-la-federal-agents-will-stay-in-la>

1 MacArthur Park with armed troops, tanks and horses.<sup>2</sup> Likely the only thing that  
2 stopped another law enforcement melee in MacArthur Park was the presence of Los  
3 Angeles Mayor Karen Bass, other elected officials, and community leaders to  
4 challenge ICE.



18 The day *after* Plaintiffs filed this Ex Parte Application, LAPD officers kettled  
19 journalists and blocked them from accessing the police response to a protest in  
20 Downtown Los Angeles on July 4th. *See* Supplemental Declaration of Adam Rose  
21 and Supplemental Declaration of Sean Beckner-Carmitchel, both concurrently filed  
22 with Plaintiffs' Reply. Less than two weeks before, at an ICE raid protest in Pacoima,  
23 LAPD officers once again restrained journalists from where they could cover the ICE  
24 actions and community protests and where one photojournalist was arrested while

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26  
27 <sup>2</sup> Federal agents stage at MacArthur Park Monday, July 7, 2025, in Los Angeles.  
28 (AP Photo/Damian Dovarganes) at: [What to know about the troops and federal  
agents in LA's MacArthur Park](#).

1 doing his job.<sup>3</sup> The Pacoima protest followed 10 days of actions across the Los  
2 Angeles area at ICE actions where the Defendant Los Angeles Police Department  
3 was present to respond to protestor. The threat of LAPD's unlawful treatment of  
4 journalists remains ongoing.

5 Finally, even if the short time Plaintiffs required to assemble their substantial  
6 showing did constitute delay, it would not justify denying the requested relief.  
7 “[D]elay by itself is not a determinative factor in whether the grant of interim relief  
8 is just and proper.” *Cuviello v. City of Vallejo*, 944 F.3d 816, 833 (9th Cir. 2019),  
9 citing *Aguayo ex rel. N.L.R.B. v. Tomco Carburetor Co.*, 853 F.2d 744, 750 (9th Cir.  
10 1988). “Usually, delay is but a single factor to consider in evaluating irreparable  
11 injury”; indeed, “courts are loath to withhold relief *solely on that ground.*” *Id.*  
12 (citations omitted) (emphasis in *Cuviello*).<sup>4</sup>

13 As this Court recently underscored, press access to ongoing protests ““play[s]  
14 a vitally important role in holding the government accountable,’ particularly given  
15 ‘the unfortunate history of civil rights violations by LAPD officers.’” *Peltz . City of*  
16 *Los Angeles*, [2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30745 \\*18](#), 2025 WL 1412479 (C.D. Cal. Feb.  
17 20, 2025) [Doc. 71], quoting *Index Newspapers LLC v. United States Marshals*  
18 *Service*, 977 F.3d. 817, 831 (9th Cir. 2020); *Multi-Ethnic Immigrant Workers Org.*  
19 *Network v. City of Los Angeles*, 246 F.R.D. 621, 628 (C.D. Cal. 2007). With the  
20 recent events set forth by Plaintiffs, the LAPD’s “unfortunate history of civil rights  
21 violations” has only gotten longer and should be enjoined immediately.

22  
23

---

24<sup>3</sup> See Supplemental Declaration of Adam Rose at ¶¶ 2-6.

25<sup>4</sup> In *Cuviello*, the pro se plaintiff took 17 months to file for injunctive relief. The  
26 District Court held the delay undermined the claim of irreparable harm. The Ninth  
27 Circuit reversed, finding the ongoing threat was sufficient and noting that  
28 “[o]btaining injunctive relief from a federal court is not an easy task, even for a skilled  
attorney.” *Id.* at 833-834.

1           **II. PLAINTIFFS SHOWED A SUBSTANTIAL LIKELIHOOD OF**  
2           **PREVAILING**

3           **A. Plaintiffs Showed a Substantial Likelihood of Prevailing on Their First**  
4           **Amendment Claims**

5           Plaintiffs have shown that their First Amendment rights have been violated and  
6           a substantial, if not strong, likelihood they will prevail in this matter. They  
7           documented multiple instances where Defendants violated their right to access the  
8           protests, remain after a dispersal order is given, and report on police conduct in  
9           response to the protests. *Index Newspapers, supra*. The evidence submitted by  
10          Plaintiffs establishes grievous violations of their First Amendment rights, far more  
11          than is required to meet their burden for injunctive relief in this instance.

12          Defendants cite cases that do not address the special concerns for First  
13          Amendment rights and the required showing “irreparable harm.” Opp. at 6-7. “The  
14          chill on Plaintiffs’ First Amendment rights alone —‘even if it results from a threat of  
15          enforcement rather than actual enforcement—constitutes irreparable harm.’”  
*Cuviello v. City of Vallejo*, 944 F.3d 816, 832-33 (9th Cir. 2019) (citation omitted).

16          In *Cuviello*, the Circuit emphasized its “cases do not require a strong showing  
17          of irreparable harm for constitutional injuries. Where the plaintiff’s ‘First Amendment  
18          rights [are] being chilled daily, the need for immediate injunctive relief without  
19          further delay is, in fact, a direct corollary of the matter’s great importance.’ *Sanders*  
20          *Cty. Republican Cent. Comm. v. Bullock*, 698 F.3d 741, 748 (9th Cir. 2012). That  
21          [Plaintiffs] will suffer irreparable harm absent relief ‘is demonstrated by a long line  
22          of precedent establishing that the loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even  
23          minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.’” *Cuviello*,  
24          at 833 (alterations and quotations omitted in *Cuviello*).

25           **B. Plaintiffs Showed a Substantial Likelihood of Prevailing on Their State**  
26           **Law Claims**

27          Independently, Plaintiffs have shown a strong likelihood that they will prevail  
28          on their state statutory claims. Penal Code sections 409.7 and 13652, enacted by the

1 California Legislature following the assault on journalists in the 2020 George Floyd  
2 protests, provide clear and specific requirements for press access to closed protest  
3 areas and ban force by police on journalists at protests. As Plaintiffs amply  
4 demonstrate, Defendants repeatedly and blatantly ignored these laws. *See* Mem. in  
5 Support of Ex Parte Application, Dkt. No. 17, at 15-21. Defendants do not contest  
6 this showing in their opposition.

7 **III. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES TIP IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFFS**

8 Despite Plaintiffs' submission of evidence of the continued obstruction of  
9 journalists, Defendants argue that a TRO should not issue because the events giving  
10 rise to the acts Plaintiffs challenge are unlikely to recur in the next seven weeks – the  
11 time for compliance with Local Rule 7-3 with a noticed motion and a hearing on the  
12 motion. Defs. Opp. at 3-4. But the TRO Plaintiffs seek addresses only LAPD's  
13 conduct at protests as required by the First Amendment and the California  
14 Legislature. It does not limit daily patrol activities in any way. Consequently, there  
15 is no harm to Defendants from being ordered to comply with California Penal Code  
16 §§409.7 and 16352 while this Court considers Plaintiffs' claims.

17 **IV. CONCLUSION**

18 Plaintiffs' evidence satisfies each element of the test for injunctive relief. They  
19 have shown "irreparable harm" from the very real threat that Defendants will repeat  
20 their unlawful conduct unless restrained by the Court.

21 Dated: July 9, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

22 Law Office of Carol A. Sobel  
23 First Amendment Coalition  
24 Law Office of Peter Bibring  
25 Schonbrun, Seplow, Harris, Hoffman &  
Zeldes  
26 Law Office of Susan Seager

27 By: /s/ Carol A. Sobel .  
28 Attorneys for Plaintiffs